UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/657,604	09/08/2000	Jackson Brandenburg	388022000700	2714

7590 11/13/2006	EXAMINER
Edward J. Radlo, Esq.	LAFORGIA, CHRISTIAN A
(SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP)	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

Edward J. Radlo, Esq.
(SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP)
6th Floor
685 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

DATE MAILED: 11/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/657,604	BRANDENBURG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christian La Forgia	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 September 2006</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-37</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-37</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. MAILED w/ ACTION 11/10/06

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The amendment filed on 25 September 2006 has been noted and made of record.

2.   Claims 1-37 have been presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments filed 25 September 2006 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

4.   In response to applicant's arguments regarding the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of claims 1-

36, the recitation apparatus and system have not been given patentable weight because the

recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight

where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the

body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process

steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190

USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA

1951).

5.   Applicant's arguments regarding the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of claims 1-36 fail to

comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define

a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims is

statutory.

6.   In response to the Applicant's arguments regarding the 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd paragraph

rejection, the Examiner disagrees. As noted in the previous action, as well as below, the

Applicant provides for several claim limitations including a filter, an Internet serer application, a

filter server application all of which are disclosed in the Specification as being computer

programs or lines of code. Computer programs, lines of code, applets, servlets, applications, and

other examples of code are merely non-functional descriptive material since they are not claimed

as being embodied on a physical medium or being executed or acted upon. Therefore, the

rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd paragraph is maintained.

7.   In response to the Applicant's arguments that *Cook* does not disclose the buyer digitally

signing something, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As the Applicant will note in the

previous office action, as well as again below, the Examiner also cited column 6, lines 17-28 in

rejecting the previously presented claim since it was unclear where the signing took place. As

such column 6, lines 17-28 of *Cook* states:

> Member **10** makes appropriate selections from the available choices of aliases, retrieves a
> time stamp, generates a digital signature and attaches the signature to the collective
> information. Once digitally signed, charge slip **114** (the collective information including
> time stamp certificate) is encrypted and returned to the merchant Web site **106**...

As such, *Cook* discloses wherein the buyer digitally signs the collective information, thereby

teaching the Applicant's amended claim and the rejection maintained.

8.   Applicant's arguments regarding "identifying those HTTP requests from a buyer that

include data requiring a digital signature of the buyer" fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b)

because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without

specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the

references.

9.   In response to the applicant's arguments that the *Cook* fails to show creating a Web page

the Examiner disagrees. As cited below, and as well as the previous action, Figure 2 of *Cook*

discloses a web page for invoking the buyer to digitally sign the charge receipt. As such, *Cook*

teaches create a Web page for transmission to a browser controlled by the buyer, said Web page

causing the browser to invoke a signing interface enabling the buyer to digitally sign the data.

10.   In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of

applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies, such as a

description of the signing interface, are not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims

are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the

claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The Examiner

has interpreted the signing interface to be anything that allows the buyer to digitally sign the

collective information as discussed earlier.

11.   In response to the applicant's arguments that *Cook* does not disclose identifying those

HTTP requests that require a service provided by an entity other than the seller and that

"identifying" implies decision-making, the Examiner disagrees. First, the Examiner is not

concerned with what is implied by the terminology used in the claims, but what they state

outright. The Examiner is required to give the claims their broadest reasonable interpretation

thereby reducing the possibility that the claim, once issued, would be interpreted more broadly

than is justified. See MPEP § 2111. *Cook* discloses identifying HTTP requests that require a

digital signature as cited below, since *Cook* discusses digitally signing all HTTP requests in the

instant application.

12.   In response to the Applicant's arguments that the reference does not disclose coupled to

the Web application and also located at the seller's web site, an interface module adapted to

receive requests for service from the web application, format, and transmit the requests, receive

responses to the requests and forward responses to the web application, the Examiner disagrees.

As cited in the previous action, and again below, *Cook* discloses an application coupled to the seller's web site as illustrated in at least figures 1 and 3 that the centralized secure data center is coupled to seller's web server.

13.   In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies, such as the buyer digitally signing anything (with regards to claim 1), are not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

14.   In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

15.   In response to the applicant's arguments that *Cook* does not disclose identifying those HTTP requests that require a service provided by an entity other than the seller and that "identifying" implies decision-making, the Examiner disagrees. First, the Examiner is not concerned with what is implied by the terminology used in the claims, but what they state outright. The Examiner is required to give the claims their broadest reasonable interpretation thereby reducing the possibility that the claim, once issued, would be interpreted more broadly than is justified. See MPEP § 2111. *SET* discloses identifying HTTP requests that require a digital signature as cited below, since *SET* discusses digitally signing all HTTP requests in the instant application.

16.   Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a

general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out

how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

17.   See further rejections that follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

18.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or
> any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and
> requirements of this title.

19.   As per claims 1-36, merely claimed as a computer program representing a computer

listing *per se*, that is, descriptions or expressions of such a program and that is, descriptive

material *per se*, non-functional descriptive material, and is not statutory because it is not a

physical "thing" nor a statutory process, as there are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed

computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the

computer program and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the computer

program's functionality to be realized. Since a computer program is merely a set of instructions

capable of being executed by a computer, the program itself is not a process, without the

computer-readable medium needed to realize the computer program's functionality. In contrast,

a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program defines structural and

functional interrelationships between the computer program and the medium which permit the

computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. **Warmerdam**, 33 F.3d at

1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760. **In re Sarkar**, 588 F.2d 1330, 1333, 200 USPQ 132, 137 (CCPA

1978). See MPEP § 2106(IV)(B)(1)(a).

20.   As per claims 1-36, the Applicant claims integrating a seller's web site with a public key

infrastructure, wherein the public key infrastructure comprises a buyer computer having a Web

browser adapted to invoke a signing interface to digitally sign electronic messages, which is an

Applet as disclosed on page 8 of the Spec. The claim proceeds to claim a seller's bank computer

system adapted to receive service requests from the seller and to respond to those requests and

the seller's Web site comprises a filter adapted to redirect HTTP requests received from the Web

browser, wherein the filter is implemented using Microsoft Internet Server Application

Programming Interface according to page 10 of the specification. Sample code for implementing

the filter is shown in figure 4. The next limitation discloses coupled to the filter, an Internet

server application adapted to receive a redirected HTTP request from the filter and to process the

redirected HTTP requests, which is disclosed as a servlet or defined as a Internet server

application on page 10 of the specification, and is further elaborated upon on pages 11-14 and

Figure 5. Finally, the Applicant claims coupled to the Internet server application, a filter engine

adapted to receive the processed HTTP request and to identify an HTTP request that contains

data requiring a digital signature by the buyer computer, which is defined as a public class object

that extends java.lang.Object on pages 15-16.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

21.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
> subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

22.   Claims 1-16, 23-25, 28, 29, and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second

paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of

elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See

MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: the filter, the Internet

server application and the filter engine. The Applicant discloses an apparatus, but fails to

provide any tangible embodiments of the filter, the Internet server application, and the filter

engine as discussed above with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection.

Claim Rejections

23.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found

in a prior Office action.

24.   Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No.

6,675,153 to Cook et al., hereinafter Cook.

25.   As per claim 37, Cook teaches an apparatus for integrating a seller's Web site with a

public key infrastructure, said apparatus comprising:

a Web server located at the seller's Web site, see figures 1, blocks 106, 108, 3, blocks

106, 108, see also column 4, lines 42-46, column 5, lines 11-31;

a Web application coupled to the Web server and also located at the seller's Web site, the

Web application adapted to:

identify those HTTP requests from a buyer that include data requiring a digital signature

of the buyer, see figures 1, block 116, 2, blocks 114, 118, see column 1, line 62 to column 2, line

6, column 5, lines 11-31, column 6, lines 17-28, column 7, line 37 to column 9, line 22;

create a Web page for transmission to a browser controlled by the buyer said Web page

causing the browser to invoke a signing interface enabling the buyer to digitally sign the data,

see figures 1, block 116, 2, blocks 114, 118, see column 1, line 62 to column 2, line 6, column 5,

lines 11-31, column 6, lines 17-28, column 7, line 37 to column 9, line 22; and

identify HTTP requests that require a service provided by an entity other than the seller,

see figures 1, blocks 102, 104, 3, blocks 102, 104, as well as column 11, line 60 to column 12,

line 40; and

coupled to the Web application and also located at the seller's Web site, an interface

module adapted to receive a request for service from the Web application, format and transmit

the request, receive a response to the request, and forward the response to the Web application,

see figure 1, blocks 102, 104, 3 blocks 102, 104, as well as column 4, lines 56-64, column 9, line

23 to column 10, line 8.

26.   Claims 1- 3, 5-9, 23-25, 28, 29, and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over SET as taught by U.S. Patent No. 6,327,578 to Linehan, hereinafter referred to

as SET, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,717,989 to Tozzoli et al., hereinafter Tozzoli.

27.   As per claim 1, SET teaches an apparatus for integrating a seller's Web site with a public

key infrastructure, wherein:

the public key infrastructure comprises a buyer computer having a Web browser adapted ·

to invoke a signing interface to digitally sign electronic messages and a seller's bank computer

system adapted to receive service requests from the seller and respond to those requests with

digitally signed service responses comprising, see figure 1, see also column 3, lines 15-23, i.e.

while on the internet, "the merchant's computer **104** forwards the consumer's payment request

over internet path **122** during a second step to an acquirer gateway **106** operating on behalf of the

acquirer bank **108**"; the seller's Web site comprises:

redirecting HTTP requests received from the Web browser, see figure 1, see also column

3, lines 15-23, i.e. while on the internet, "the merchant's computer **104** forwards the consumer's

payment request over internet path **122** during a second step to an acquirer gateway **106**

operating on behalf of the acquirer bank **108**";

coupled to the filter, an Internet server application adapted to receive a redirected HTTP

request and process the redirected HTTP request, see figure 1, see also column 3, lines 23-32, i.e.

"The acquirer gateway **106** passes the consumer's payment request to the acquirer bank **108** over

a private network path **122'**. The acquirer bank **108** sends the consumer's payment request to the

card issuing bank **112** over the private network path **124** to check whether the consumer's credit

or debit card account is active and sufficient for the proposed transaction with the merchant. The

issuing bank **112**, as the card issuer, authorizes the transaction in a message sent over the private

path **126** to the acquiring bank **108**. The acquiring bank **108** sends the transaction authorization

over private path **128'** to the acquirer gateway **106**, signing the message with the acquiring

bank's digital signature";

coupled to the Internet server application, a filter engine adapted to receive processed

HTTP requests from the Internet server application and to identify HTTP requests that contains

data requiring a digital signature by the buyer computer, see figure 1 and column 3, lines 32-39,

i.e. "The acquirer gateway **106** forwards it over the internet path **128** to the merchant, authorizing

from the merchant to proceed with the transaction. Once the merchant has received the

transaction authorization from the acquirer gateway **106**, the merchant completes the sales

transaction with the consumer."

28.   SET does not disclose the use of a filter or filter engine.

29.   Tozzoli discusses the use of filtering when processing transactions over the Internet. It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

include filtering, since Tozzoli discloses in column 11, lines 52-57 that such a modification

allows the merchant to verify and access data fields quickly and process the order accurately.

30.   Regarding claim 2, SET discloses a bank interface adapted to receive the request and

transmitting the request to the seller's bank in figure 1, blocks 106, 122', and 142', as well as

column 3, lines 13-47.

31.   Tozzoli discloses the filter engine and reformatting the request in figures 3a-3c, column

7, line 42 to column 8, line 3, column 11, lines 52-58, and column 12, line 64 to column 13, line

4.

32.   With regards to claim 3, SET teaches wherein the bank interface is further adapted to

receive a service response to the request from the seller's bank and forward the response to the

filter engine, see figure 1, as well as column 3, lines 13-47.

33.   Regarding claim 5, Tozzoli teaches a Web server adapted to parse requests redirected by

the filter, see figure 5, as well as column 7, line 53 to column 8, line 12.

34.   Regarding claim 6, SET teaches wherein services provided by the seller's bank are

provided within the context of a four-corner model, see figure 1.

35.   With regards to claim 7, SET teaches wherein the four-corner model comprises the buyer,

the seller, the seller's bank, and a buyer's bank, see figure 1, where the buyer is the consumer,

block 102, the seller is the merchant, block 104, the seller's bank is the acquiring bank, block

108, and the buyer's bank is the issuing bank, block 112.

36.   Regarding claim 8, neither SET nor Tozzoli disclose wherein the filter is implemented

using ISAPI.

37.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to implement the filter using ISAPI, since it has been held that ISAPI is an easy-to-

use, high performance interface for back-end applications and has significant performance

advantages over the CGI specification, such as having its own dynamic-link library.

38.   Regarding claim 9, SET teaches wherein the Internet service application is adapted to

generate HTTP responses based on data received from the filter engine, see column 3, lines 13-

47.

39.   Regarding claim 23, Tozzoli and SET do not teach wherein the filter engine determines

whether an HTTP request contains data requiring signature by applying filtering rules.

40.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have the filter engine determine if the data required a signature, since SET discloses

at column 3, lines 32-47 that such a modification would ensure that the transaction was

authorized by the appropriate user.

41.   Regarding claim 24, Tozzoli and SET do not teach wherein the filter engine is

programmed to recognize each HTTP request that includes data requiring signature.

42.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have the filter engine recognize that the data has a digital signature, since SET

discloses at column 3, lines 32-47 that such a modification would ensure that the transaction was

authorized by the appropriate user.

43.   Regarding claim 25, Tozzoli and SET do not teach wherein the filter engine is

programmed to recognize HTTP requests transmitted by the Web browser that have been

modified to include a special tag that indicates whether the request includes data that requires

signature.

44.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have the filter engine recognize special tags that indicate the request for a digital

signature, since SET discloses at column 3, lines 32-47 that such a modification would ensure

that the transaction was authorized by the appropriate user.

45.   Regarding claim 28, neither SET nor Tozzoli teach wherein the filter engine provides an

abstracted front-end interface via java remote method invocation.

46.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made for the filter to comprise of an abstracted front-end, since it has been held that an

abstracted front-end is an easy-to-use, high performance interface for linking to back-end

applications.

47.   Regarding claim 29, Tozzoli teaches wherein the filter engine employs a rules class, see

column 11, line 52 to column 12, line 11.

48.   Regarding claim 31, neither SET nor Tozzoli teach wherein the bank interface is

designed with a plug-in based architecture.

49.   Linehan discloses wherein the bank interface is designed with a plug-in based

architecture. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to design the bank interface with a plug-in based architecture, since Linehan

discloses at column 9, lines 3-28 that such a modification would allow the bank to operate with

foreign consumers.

50.   Regarding claim 32, SET and Tozzoli do not teach wherein the bank interface supports

an abstract front-end interface to allow communication via a plurality of middleware

technologies.

51.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made for the filter to comprise of an abstracted front-end, since it has been held that an

abstracted front-end is an easy-to-use, high performance interface for interacting with

middleware from a plurality of vendors.

52.   Regarding claim 33, SET teaches wherein the bank interface is adapted to create and

transmit OCSP requests, see column 3, lines 25-47.

53.   Regarding claim 34, SET teaches wherein the bank interface comprises a certificate

status check module, see column 3, lines 25-47.

54.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SET in view of

Tozzoli as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Linehan.

55.   With regards to claim 4, SET does not disclose wherein the service is certificate

validation of a buyer digital certificate.

56.   Linehan discloses certificate validation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include certificate validation, since Linehan

states at column 4, lines 23-44 that such a modification would serve to validate that the payment

was authorized by the card holder.

57.   Claims 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SET in

view of Tozzoli as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,052,785 to

Lin et al., hereinafter Lin.

58.   Regarding claim 10, neither SET nor Tozzoli disclose wherein the Internet server

application is adapted to pass a hash table to the filter engine.

59.   Lin teaches wherein the Internet server application is adapted to pass a hash table to the

filter engine. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have the server application pass a hash table to the filter engine, since Lin

discloses at column 8, lines 43-56 that such a modification supports authentication, which is

necessary to prevent fraudulent transactions.

60.   With regards to claim 11, Lin teaches wherein the hash table comprises the headers from

the redirected HTTP request, see figure 3, as well as column 8, line 51 to column 9, line 17.

61.   With regards to claim 12, Lin teaches wherein the hash table comprises the method of the

redirected HTTP request, see figure 3, as well as column 8, line 51 to column 9, line 17.

62.   With regards to claim 13, Lin teaches wherein the hash table comprises the content-type

of the redirected HTTP request, see figure 3, as well as column 8, line 51 to column 9, line 17.

63.   With regards to claim 14, Lin teaches wherein the hash table comprises the buyer

computer's IP address, see figure 3, as well as column 8, line 51 to column 9, line 17.

64.   With regards to claim 15, Lin teaches wherein the hash table comprises the actual data in

the redirected HTTP request, see figure 3, as well as column 8, line 51 to column 9, line 17.

65.   With regards to claim 16, Lin teaches wherein the hash table comprises a unique session

ID, see figure 3, as well as column 8, line 51 to column 9, line 17.

Conclusion

66.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

67.   A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

68.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Christian La Forgia whose telephone number is (571) 272-3792.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 7-5.

69.   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

70.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Christian LaForgia
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2131

clf